



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/726,701

12/04/2003

Kazushige Hatori

00862.023346.

9227

5514

7590

09/01/2010

FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO

1290 Avenue of the Americas

NEW YORK, NY 10104-3800

EXAMINER

MCCOMMAS, BRENDAN N

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2625

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

09/01/2010

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/726,701	Applicant(s) HATORI ET AL.	
	Examiner BRENDAN MCCOMMAS	Art Unit 2625	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 June 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 17-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 17-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 04 December 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. **Claims 17-22** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by Miyahara (United States Patent 6,956,665) further in view of Owa et al. (United States Patent 6,348,971) hereinafter referenced Owa further in view of Schwier et al. (United States Patent 6,924,906) hereinafter referenced as Schwier.

3. **Regarding claim 17**, Miyahara discloses a print server, method and system capable of handling different kinds of data. In addition Miyahara discloses a print service system, where all the devices are connected to each other, comprising:

4. an acquiring unit adapted to acquire a designated type of print devices for printing a content based on a print order, as disclosed in column 8, lines 26-42;

5. a judging unit adapted to judge whether or not the print order for the content indicates in color printing, as disclosed in column 8, lines 26-42; and

6. an assigning unit adapted to control the printing of the content so as to generate a plurality of print jobs based on the print order, assign the generated plurality of print jobs to a plurality of print devices having a designated type matching with the print order, respectively, and print the content using the print order for the plurality of print

Art Unit: 2625

devices when said first judging unit judges that the print order for the content does not indicate in color printing, but so as to generate a single print job based on the print order, assign the generated single print job to a single print device selected from among a plurality of print devices having a designated type matching with the print order, and print the content using the assigned single one print device having the designated type when said first judging unit judges that the print order for the content indicates in color printing, (In this case the plurality of jobs are all black and white and so are sent to different black and white printers on the network, and when the job is all color it is sent to the only one printer that is color on the network, and the data is not mixed in the jobs between black and white) as disclosed in column 8, lines 44-67 and column 9, lines 52-67.

7. However Miyara fails to explicitly disclose an assigning unit adapted to determine whether to use a plurality of print devices having the designated type or a single print device having the designated type on printing the content in accordance with a judged result by said first judging unit, wherein said assigning unit determines to use the plurality of print devices when said first judging means judges that the print order does not indicate color printing or to use the single print device when said first judging means judges that the print order indicates color printing and wherein the assigning unit determines the plurality of devices or the single device depending on the designated type. However it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to make such a modification to the invention of Miyahara, as taught by Owa. In a similar field of endeavor, Owa discloses a printing system and printing

Art Unit: 2625

method for selecting an optimum printing for printing. In addition Owa discloses a determination unit, which is controlled by the user and is adapted to determine whether to use a plurality of print devices having the designated type or a single print device having the designated type on printing the content in accordance with a judged result by said first judging unit, wherein said determination unit determines to use the plurality of print devices when said first judging means judges that the print order does not indicate color printing or to use the single print device when said first judging means judges that the print order indicates color printing and wherein the determination unit determines the plurality of devices or the single device depending on the designated type, (when the selection leads to only 1 printer on the network meeting the color requirement) as disclosed in column 5, lines 63-67 and column 6, lines 1-27, and column 14, lines 16-67 . Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the modification of for the purpose of streamlining the printing process in a printer network, as disclosed in Owa column 3, lines 1-15. However Owa and Miyahara fail to explicitly disclose the print order including information indicating color printing or monochrome printing and information designating a type of print device;

8. a judging unit configured to judge whether or not the print order indicates color printing or monochrome printing and so as to print the plurality print pages in parallel by the plurality of print device, dispersively, when the plurality of print devices in the type designated in the print order exist in the print system and said judging unit judges that the print order does not indicate color indicates monochrome printing and designated in the print order so as to print the plurality of print pages by only the single color print

Art Unit: 2625

device, together, when the plurality of color print devices in the type designated in the print order exist in the print system. However it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include such a modification to the invention as taught by Schwier. Schwier discloses the print order including information indicating color printing or monochrome printing and information designating a type of print device;

9. a judging unit configured to judge whether or not the print order indicates color printing or monochrome printing and so as to print the plurality print pages in parallel by the plurality of print device, dispersively, when the plurality of print devices in the type designated in the print order exist in the print system and said judging unit judges that the print order does not indicate color indicates monochrome printing and designated in the print order so as to print the plurality of print pages by only the single color print device, together, when the plurality of color print devices in the type designated in the print order exist in the print system as disclosed in column 2, lines 36-60. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include such a modification to the invention for the purpose of allowing a number of devices to cooperate in a flexible manner as disclosed in column 2, lines 34-36.

10. **Claims 18-22** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miyahara (United States Patent 6,956,665), further in view of Owa et al. (United States Patent 6,348,971) hereinafter referenced Owa, further in view of Schwier et al. (United States Patent 6,924,906) hereinafter referenced as Schwier further in view of Tanaka (U.S. Patent Publication 2002/0093680).

11. **Regarding claim 18**, Miyahara, Schwier and Owa disclose everything claimed as applied above (see claim 11).

12. However Miyahara fails to explicitly disclose the system further comprising a wherein the print order is determined by a log of the print history. However it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include such a modification to Miyahara, as disclosed in Tanaka.

13. In a similar field of endeavor, Tanaka discloses a print system. In addition Tanaka discloses wherein the print order is determined by a log of the print history, as disclosed in [0054].

14. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the invention of Miyahara, to include the modifications of Tanaka for the purpose of reprinting any failed print attempts stored in the history, as disclosed in [0004]-[0007].

15. **Regarding claims 19-22**, Miyahara, Schwier Owa and Tanaka disclose everything claimed as applied above (see claim 17-18). In addition claim 19-22 are interpreted and rejected for the reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 17-18. Claim 19-22 describes an apparatus, and claim 17-18 describes the specific method used to implement the apparatus. Thus claims 19-22 are rejected.

Response to Arguments

12. Applicant's arguments filed 01/29/2010 have been fully considered but they are moot on the new grounds of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BRENDAN MCCOMMAS whose telephone number is (571)270-3575. The examiner can normally be reached on IFP.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Twyler Haskins can be reached on (571)272-7406. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2625

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/ Brendan N. McCommas/
Examiner, Art Unit 2625

/B. M./
Examiner, Art Unit 2625

/Twyler L. Haskins/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2625